

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is submitted in accordance with the Revised Amendment Format.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-25 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13-14, 16-19, and 21-22 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,003,773 to Hoenning et al. ("Hoenning"), in view of U.S. Patent 7,380,250 B2 to Schechter ("Schechter").

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 10 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoenning, in view of Schechter, as applied to claims 3 and 9, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,300,947 B1 to Kanevsky ("Kanevsky").

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 15, and 20 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoenning et al., in view of Schechter et al., as applied to claims 1, 13, and 18 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047383 A1 to Dutta ("Dutta").

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoenning et al., in view of Schechter et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033356 A1 to Tran et al. ("Tran").

The Examiner has rejected claims 23-25 of this Application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoenning et al., in view of Schechter et al., as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225656 A1 to Sarkar ("Sarkar").

Claims 1, 9, 13, 16, 18, 21, and 23 have been amended.

Claims 22 and 25 are canceled without prejudice.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On July 9, 2009, a telephone interview was conducted regarding this case. Attending the telephone interview were Examiner Verdi and Applicant's representative Chad Walsh (Reg. No. 43,235). During the interview, the invention and the prior art were discussed. The limitations of claim 1 and 25 were discussed. The amendments and arguments herein were proposed and appeared to overcome the prior art of record.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants have amended the claims to address the Section 112 issues. The Examiner's suggestions have been substantially incorporated into the claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants have amended claim 21 to address the Section 101 issues as discussed during the interview.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The central issue in this case is whether the independent claims are obvious over Hoennig and Schechter. The claims have been amended as discussed during the interview to overcome the prior art of record.

Independent claim 1, as amended, provides;

“A computer program product, tangibly embodied in a machine-readable storage device, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

identify at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer, where the one or more selection data elements specify an adapter type; and

use the selection data elements to select an adapter at the client abstraction layer to convert communication data between an application running on the server and one or more client programs,

the adapter being used by the client abstraction layer as an intermediary, the adapter hiding client-specific behavior from the application running on the server, the adapter being designed for use with a particular client program,

wherein the adapter is selected from one or more suitable adapters based on a priority list, wherein the priority list ranks the plurality of adapters according to pre-defined criteria.”

(Claim 1, emphasis added).

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that adapters are selected by specifying the adapter type in the request. The prior art of record does not teach selection of client adapters by specifying the particular adapter type to use. Rather, Hoennig as understood teaches that the service (service object) offers “a plurality of interfaces” (offer-interfaces). Hoennig, col. 15, line 6. The user-request includes a “request-interface.” Hoennig, col. 14, line 38. Thus, as understood, the user request in Hoennig includes information (the request interface) for specifying the interface of the client that is making the request. In Hoennig, the adapter is selected in response to an “adapter request” from the service object. Hoennig, col. 14, lines 52-53. The adapter request, in turn, “includes information on service object offer-interfaces...and information on the request interface.” Hoennig, col. 14, lines 54-56. Accordingly, Hoennig selects adapters by collecting information on the required client interface (the request interface in the user request) and the required server interface (the offered interfaces) and selects an adapter that can bridge the interfaces. However, claim 1 specifies the adapter type to be used in the client request itself. This is not disclosed in the prior art.

Further, claim 1 as amended recites that the adapter is selected from suitable adapters on a ranked priority list. Hoennig discloses adapters may be “selected based on a classifier.” Hoennig, col. 3, lines 26-27. Classification and selection of adapters is substantially different than selecting based on a ranked priority list because classification does not involve ranking.

For the above reasons, a combination of Hoennig and Schechter do not render claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Claims 2-12 are dependent claims that include all the limitations of claim 1 and include additional limitations. For at least the same or similar reasons, these claims are also allowable.

Independent claims 13, 16, 18, and 21 include substantially the same limitations mentioned above that are not disclosed in the prior art of record. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 14-15, 17, 19-20, and 23-24 are dependent claims that include all the limitations of respective independent claims and include additional limitations. For at least the same or similar reasons, these claims are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 408-244-6319.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chad R. Walsh, Reg#43235/

Chad R. Walsh
Reg. No. 43,235

FOUNTAINHEAD LAW GROUP P.C.
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 200
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel: 408-244-6319